

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes and allowed to use a prop; and that, when I finish, Senator TESTER be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF TRACY STONE-MANNING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the Senate should emphatically oppose the nomination of Tracy Stone-Manning to lead the Nation's Bureau of Land Management.

It is hard to believe, but she has colluded with ecoterrorists, plain and simple. She stonewalled a criminal investigation for years. She lied to the Senate, and she still holds radically dangerous views; and yet she is still the nominee of the President of the United States for this very important post. It is outrageous.

Let's begin with her ties to ecoterrorists. We worry about terrorism in this world and in this country. By her own admission in her court testimony, when she was in graduate school, she collaborated with ecoterrorists who had hammered hundreds of metal spikes into trees in a national forest. It was in Idaho.

Tree spiking involves hammering a metal rod, like this one, into a tree trunk. This can do serious damage. They put about 500 pounds of these in tree trunks in a national forest. If a logger or firefighter cuts this rod—you say, Why would a firefighter be there? They have chainsaws and they work to clear areas to try to fight fires, or a logger taking down trees—the saw will shatter, shrapnel will fly in every direction, and the user of that saw could become terribly injured or even killed. If a sawblade comes across a spike like this in a sawmill, the saw can explode. The results could be catastrophic to both life and limb.

Well, ecoterrorists who spike trees absolutely know what they are doing. It is always premeditated. Even the Washington Post has labeled tree spiking as one of the most vicious tactics of the ecoterrorists. That is what we are dealing with President Biden's nominee to be the Director of Bureau of Land Management.

You say: What is her connection to this horrible, horrible practice?

Well, she has admitted that she edited, typed, and then anonymously sent a threat letter to the U.S. Forest Service on behalf of known tree spikers. She and her Democrat defenders have claimed this letter was a warning so no one would get hurt. That is false.

Here are just a few quotes from the letter she typed and she mailed to the U.S. Forest Service:

You bastards go in there anyway and a lot of people could get hurt.

And:

I would be more than willing to pay you a dollar for the sale, but you would have to find me first and that could be your WORST nightmare.

Think about these lines. Think about what it must be like if you had re-

ceived such a letter. She mailed this threatening letter to the target of the tree spiking—and that was the U.S. Forest Service—because she didn't want any trees in that area to be harvested.

She and her circle of friends were investigated for their involvement with this ecoterrorist network and the attack. She was subpoenaed. She had to give hair samples, palm sample, handwriting, fingerprint samples to investigators.

All this time, she knew who the tree spikers were. She could have gone to the authorities to identify them, but she refused, didn't cooperate with investigators. The lead investigator on the case wrote a letter to Chairman MANCHIN and to me after she had testified in the Senate to the Energy Committee, and he referred to her as the "nastiest of the suspects."

He also said she not only had knowledge of the plan to spike the trees with spikes like this, she was one of the planners. She was a ringleader. The lead investigator in the criminal case wrote:

It became clear that Ms. Stone-Manning was an active member of the original group that planned the spiking of the Post Office timber sale.

Now, he wasn't the only one who said she knew about it in advance. In an interview recently, within the last couple of months, with the E&E News, one of the convicted tree spikers, one of those who went to jail for doing this, he also confirmed that Tracy Stone-Manning, the President's nominee to run the Bureau of Land Management, to be in charge of the national forests—that Tracy Stone-Manning knew of the plan to spike the trees well in advance. This was premeditated.

So who have we heard from?

We heard from the criminal who is in jail—went to jail. We heard from the cop who prosecuted the case. Both the cop and the criminal agree that she was involved and she knew about the plan to spike the trees.

According to the investigator's letter, Ms. Stone-Manning's lack of cooperation would set back the investigation for years. From 1990 until the end of 1992, the case went cold. Remember, she knew who spiked the trees. She was protecting the ecoterrorists' identities the entire time.

Eventually, Ms. Stone-Manning was identified, and she received an investigation target letter to let her know she was being targeted as part of the investigation. The lead investigator said she only agreed to testify after she was caught and after her lawyer negotiated an immunity deal to testify.

Her defenders have said she helped put the bad guys away. In fact, President Biden's nominee is one of the bad guys. She helped plan the tree spiking. She covered up the terrorist activity for years. She did not cooperate with the authorities, and she only testified after she was caught and received immunity.

After all of this, she lied to the Committee about the incident. On a sworn affidavit in her Committee questionnaire, she said she was not the target of any investigation. We know that is a lie. We know she received a letter that she was a target of the investigation.

She complained in the press about how degrading it was to be investigated. Then why did she tell us she was never investigated and told the press how bad it was and degrading to be investigated?

She also admitted to the press that she could have been charged with a crime if not for her immunity deal.

She also lied about her involvement in the tree spiking. I asked her directly:

Did you have personal knowledge of, participate in, or in any way directly or indirectly support activities associated with the spiking of trees in any forest during your lifetime?

And she replied "no."

She sent their letter. She knew the plan in advance. She knew their identities, and she refused to tell the authorities.

How is that not supporting activities associated with ecoterrorism and tree spiking?

Finally, Senate Democrats are very quick to say this tree-spiking episode was decades ago, can't be relevant anymore, in spite of the fact that it is a Federal crime—as if collusion with terrorists is just a youthful indiscretion. But she lied this year when she came to testify to the U.S. Senate. She lied to our committee and she lied to this institution.

It is clear to me that her radical views have not changed. In September of 2020, 1 year ago, she tweeted an article written by her husband that calls—because she would be in charge of areas related to the forest—retweeted an article by her husband that calls for homes in forests to be left to burn during wildfires.

Senator SULLIVAN talked about the fires in Alaska. We have had fires in Wyoming. We have firefighters in there protecting structures and human life.

Her husband says: Let them burn.

Her husband wrote:

There's a rude and satisfying justice in burning down the house of someone who builds in the forest.

"Rude and satisfying justice in burning down" someone's home.

Tracy Stone-Manning isn't responsible for the views of her husband, but a year ago—not as graduate student decades ago—we are talking now, as wildfires burn across the country, she actually endorsed her husband's views on letting the houses burn. In a tweet, she called her husband's writing a "clarion call."

Well, clarion call, if you look it up, means a call to action.

As the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Tracy Stone-Manning would be in charge of firefighting operations on public lands. Yet her husband and the things she retweets say: Let it burn.

Apparently, she is comfortable leaving the houses and homes of our constituents in the Rocky Mountain West to burn because they built their homes in the forest. I have constituents who have homes in the forest. I am sure almost every Senator does. This tweet wasn't 30 years ago. This tweet was 1 year ago.

Who actually thinks her beliefs are different today?

Her views on firefighting are just the tip of the iceberg. In her graduate thesis, she actually argued that Americans need to have fewer children. You know why? Because she says children are a threat to the environment. She actually called children "environmental hazards."

Can you find the environmental hazard in this photo?

She told her readers to "stop at one or two."

She even made ads like this one to promote these ideas, the child as an environmental hazard. And she is the nominee of the President of the United States for an important position in this government.

She answered her own question by saying: Oh, yes, you can find the environmental hazard, "that's right, it's the cute baby."

This thesis isn't the only time she argued for human population control. In an essay in the High Country News, she said Americans were "breeding our weapons" in the war on the grizzly bear. She concludes that essay by saying: "We should wage war on overpopulation."

These are ideas you hear in communist China, not from the nominee to be the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in the United States.

Mr. President, there are many qualified Democrats who could run the Bureau of Land Management and do a fine job of it. We should reject this nomination, and the President can nominate someone else.

It is astonishing to me to see Democrats digging in to defend a proven liar, an ecoterrorist collaborator who still holds very dangerous and threatening beliefs.

Bob Abbey was the BLM Director under President Barack Obama. He said her actions "should disqualify her" from leading this important Agency. One Biden administration official admitted on NBC News her nomination was a "massive vetting failure." So Obama's BLM Director said she should be disqualified—her actions should disqualify her—and a Biden administration official calls it a "massive vetting failure."

And when our Committee asked the Interior Secretary, Deb Haaland, about Stone-Manning's views, her response was: "I didn't nominate her."

Well, no, she didn't. The President of the United States did. This is clearly not a rousing endorsement coming from fellow Democrats—the White House, former BLM Director under President Obama, and now the Secretary of Interior.

If she is confirmed, Senate Democrats will be held wholly responsible. They should consider carefully if they want their name associated with Tracy Stone-Manning. Tracy Stone-Manning should never be the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

I strongly oppose her nomination. Every Republican—every Republican—strongly opposes her nomination, and Senate Democrats should do the same. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. I want to thank you, Mr. President, the fine Senator from Georgia, for the recognition.

Look, I have been listening to the debate here, or the conversation—however you want to say it—on the floor for the last hour and a half about Tracy Stone-Manning.

I will tell you that I take advice and consent that the United States has, and the Members of this body has, very seriously. That means not just picking up talking points the leadership might give you and reciting them back on the floor time and time and time again—which, by the way, I heard the same talking points time and time and time again for the last hour and a half. But it is to find out what is going on with this person because it is our duty to make sure there are good people in these Agencies.

I wish we had taken that same kind of thought with some of the folks President Trump put forth, but it seems, though, the rules have changed.

Now we are going to take a good woman—a good woman—the State of Montana knows well. In fact, she was vetted in the State of Montana. They said all these accusations have no merit. We are going to run her through the ringer here—character assassination like I have never seen before.

But let's be honest. What is this really about? Is this about Tracy Stone-Manning? No. This is about the Republicans in the Senate trying to make Joe Biden look bad. That is what this is about. Make no mistake about it—that is what this is about.

So let's get back to the issue at hand, and that is the person who has been nominated to run the BLM, Tracy Stone-Manning—somebody I have known for the last 25 years; somebody I have worked with for the last 20 years; somebody who, when she was on my staff, worked with the wood products industry, worked with recreation folks—worked with everybody out there—to write a bill on how we could better manage our national forests with Montana input.

She is somebody who lives by the statement "You have two ears and one mouth; act accordingly." She is somebody who knows the value of collaboration. She is somebody who can listen, who can reason, and who knows our public lands and has recreated on our public lands for her entire life.

She is somebody who will run the BLM in a hell of a lot better way than

this dude by the name of Pendley, who sat in that office, unconfirmed, for months after months after months in the previous administration, and nobody on the Republican side of the aisle said a thing about him. He is somebody who wanted to sell off our public lands, somebody who really didn't care about access to them.

But we have a person today we can confirm who can, once again, make the BLM the Agency it needs to be; somebody who understands multiple use; somebody who understands that the BLM needs to be run by a professional. Tracy Stone-Manning is a professional. I would encourage everybody to vote for her.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

VOTE ON STONE-MANNING NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Stone-Manning nomination?

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 401 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hagerty	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Burr	Hoeben	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Lummis	Tillis
Daines	Marshall	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NOT VOTING—5

Blackburn	Moran	Tuberville
Cornyn	Paul	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid